

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,458	06/01/2001	Joshua M. Conner	068354.1439	8446
31625 7	590 08/30/2005		EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. PATENT DEPARTMENT			MEONSKE, TONIA L	
	NTO BLVD., SUITE 1500		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX	78701-4039		2183	
			DATE MAILED: 08/30/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u></u>		I A I' ma(-)			
/	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	09/870,458	CONNER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication on	Tonia L. Meonske	2183			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with t	me correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply oly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS e, cause the application to become ABANI	be timely filed D) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/10	<u> 2/05</u> .	14			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 19-34 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 19-34 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Appli rity documents have been rec u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No reived in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/4/05. S Patent and Trademotic Office.		ail Date nal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2183

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim19 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 3, please change "produces" to "produce". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 24, 25, and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. Claim 24 recites the limitation "the shift increment" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 5. Claim 25 recites the limitation "the shift increment" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
- 6. Claim 29 recites the limitation "the operand" in lines 21 and 22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 30-34 are rejected for incorporating the defects of claim 29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2183

8. Claims 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

- 9. The language of the claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. See Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63 (1972) and In re Benson and Tabbot, 169 USPQ 548 (CCPA 1971).
- 10. Mental processes and abstract intellectual concepts are not patentable as they are the basic tools of scientific and technological work. Claims 19-28 merely claim a method of shifting and concatenating values to produce a result, or the manipulation of an abstraction. See claim 8 in Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63 (1972).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 12. Claims 19-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Intel's Pentium Processor Family Developer's Manual, Volume 3: Architecture and Programming Manual (herein after Intel).
- 13. Referring to claim 19, Intel has taught a method of shifting a multi-word value comprising:

Art Unit: 2183

a. performing a first shift operation on a first portion of the multi-word value to produces one or more overflow bits (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, Bits are shifted out of the source register.);

- b. performing a second shift operation on a second portion of the multi-word value,
- c. where the second shift operation comprises:
 - i. producing a shift result; and concatenating the shift result and the overflow bits (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, A lower portion of bits of the destination are concatenated with the bits shifted out of the source register.).
- 14. Referring to claim 20, Intel has taught the method of claim 19, where the second shift operation is a multi-precision shift instruction, and where the second shift operation produces a result, the method further comprising:
 - a. fetching and decoding the multi-precision shift instruction (Page 18-7, First paragraph, Instructions are inherently fetched and decoded in the processing system, Pages 4-16 and 4-17, SHLD and SHRD); and
 - b. outputting the result (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, The result is stored back into, or output to the destination operand.).
- 15. Referring to claim 21, Intel has taught the method of claim 20, as described above, and where the multi-precision shift instruction is a shift left instruction (Page 4-16, SHLD).
- 16. Referring to claim 22, Intel has taught the method of claim 20, as described above, and where the multi-precision shift instruction is a shift right instruction (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, SHRD).

Art Unit: 2183

17. Referring to claim 23, Intel has taught the method of claim 20, as described above, and where the multi-precision shift instruction specifies a shift increment (Page 4-16, The CL register or an immediate byte in the instruction specifies the number of bits to be shifted.).

- 18. Referring to claim 24, Intel has taught the method of claim 20, as described above, and where the shift increment is greater than or equal to the number of bits in a word (Page 4-19).
- 19. Referring to claim 25, Intel has taught the method according to claim 20, as described above, and where the shift increment is less than the number of bits in a word (Pages 4-16, 25-289 to 25-290).
- 20. Referring to claim 26, Intel has taught the method of claim 19, as described above, and further comprising:
 - a. storing one or more bits shifted out of the second portion of the multi-word value during the second shift instruction in a carry register (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, CF).
- 21. Referring to claim 28, Intel has taught the method of claim 19, as described above, and further comprising:
 - a. storing one or more of the overflow bits in a carry register (Pages 4-16 and 4-17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 09/870,458

Art Unit: 2183

23. Claims 27 and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Intel's Pentium Processor Family Developer's Manual, Volume 3: Architecture and Programming Manual (herein after Intel), in view of Silverbrook, US Patent 6,314,200.

Page 6

- 24. Referring to claim 27, Intel has taught the method of claim 19, as described above. Intel has not specifically taught all of the logical operations required to implement the shift instructions. Specifically, Intel has not taught where concatenating the shift result and the overflow bits comprises: performing a logical OR operation on at least one bit in the shift result and at least one overflow bit. However, Silverbrook et al. have taught performing a logical OR operation on at least one bit in a shift result and at least one overflow bit (column 222, lines 10-24) in order to implement multiple precision shifting. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the invention of Intel, include performing the claimed OR operation, as taught by Silverbrook et al., for the desirable purpose of implementing multiple precision shifting (column 222, lines 10-24).
- 25. Referring to claim 29, Intel has taught a processor for processing multi-precision shift instructions, comprising:
 - a. a program memory for storing instructions including at least one multi-precision shift instruction (Page 3-2, lines 1-3);
 - b. a program counter for identifying current instructions for processing (Page 3-15, section 3.3.5, Instruction Pointer), and
 - c. a barrel shifter for executing shift instructions (Page 4-16 and 4-17), including the at least one multi-precision shift instruction (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, SHLD and SHRD), the barrel shifter including:

Art Unit: 2183

i. one or more carry registers for storing values shifted out of sections of the barrel shifter (Page 4-16 and 4-17, CF); and logic for concatenating values stored in one or more carry registers with values in the barrel shifter (pages 25-289 to 25-292); and

- d. where the barrel shifter is operable to shift a multi-word value (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, SHLD and SHRD shift doubleword operands), and where when shifting a multi-word value the barrel shifter:
 - i. executes at least one shift instruction to:
 - (1) load a first operand into a section within the barrel shifter, where the first operand is a first portion of the multi-word value (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, The source operand is loaded into the source register.); and
 - (2) generate one or more overflow bits (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, Bits are shifted out of the source register.); and
- e. executes at least one multi-precision shift instruction fetched from the program memory (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, The SHRD and SHLD instruction are executed.) to:
 - i. load a second operand into a section within the barrel shifter, where the second operand is a second portion of the multi-word value (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, The destination operand is loaded into the destination register.);
 - ii. shift the operand; concatenate the operand with one or more of the overflow bits (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, A lower portion of bits of the destination are concatenated with the bits shifted out of the source register.); and

Art Unit: 2183

ii. output the shifted value (Pages 4-16 and 4-17, The result is stored back into, or output to the destination operand.).

- 26. Intel has not specifically taught all of the hardware logic required to implement the shift instructions. Intel has not specifically taught OR logic for concatenating values stored in the one or more carry registers with values in the barrel shifter. Silverbrook et al. have taught OR logic for concatenating values stored in carry registers with values in the barrel shifter (column 222, lines 10-24) in order to implement multiple precision shifting. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the invention of Intel, include the claimed OR logic, as taught by Silverbrook et al., for the desirable purpose of implementing multiple precision shifting (column 222, lines 10-24).
- 27. Claims 30-34 do not recite limitations above the claimed invention set forth in claims 11-15 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 11-15 above.

Response to Arguments

28. Examiner notes that Applicant has not provided any arguments from which to respond.

Conclusion

- 29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tonia L. Meonske whose telephone number is (571) 272-4170. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, with every other Friday off.
- 30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie P. Chan can be reached on (571) 272-4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2183

31. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tlm

EDDIE CHAN ORY PATENT EXAMINER

UPERVISURY TYNCENTER 2100